

## PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT COUNTIES

Advisory Meeting

September 13, 2000

DSS Training Center

815 "S" Street, Eureka Room

Sacramento, California

### SUMMARY

Attendees included: Rios, H.; Neely, P.; Sarceda, V.; Dershewitz, G.; Johnson, J.; Epps, E.; Baca, J.; Hamilton, H.; Greer, G.; Silvia, M.; Roca, R.; Corder, W.; Monson, N.; Casey, G.; Gutierrez, A.; Carpenter, J.; Hernandez, H.; Trujillo, R.; Morgan, R.; Waters, C.; Wilmer, J.; Wilmer, R.; Bowman-Jones, M.; Ghens, W.; Flores, P.; Parker, J.

1. Welcome-Joeana Carpenter welcomed all the attendees to the September meeting.
2. Agenda Review-Joeana Carpenter reviewed the proposed agenda and no new items were added.
3. Summary Review-Joeana Carpenter reviewed the summary of the August, 2000 meeting and no changes were identified.
4. Northern Regional Meeting Report-Gerry Greer reported that the PMC counties wanted more information in writing; he stated that they see drafts but that no final products were being shared by the state. PMC counties wanted to know how the sample size was being determined. They would like the State, at a future meeting, to provide information on how the TANF sample is selected and how the size of the sample is determined. Also, the PMC counties would like to know the WTW30 rate. Joeana noted that there had been some file layout problems that had prevented the release of the rates. Joeana indicated that the state would soon retransmit the data after which participation rates will be published. The counties would like training on documentation standards currently in place by the federal agencies. The PMC counties would also like to include CalWORKs data collection only cases in the training package. The counties also stated they need definitions for version 24.8 of the Q5. Richard Trujillo indicated that the definitions had been previously submitted for inclusion on our web site. Richard will follow up with Joyce Traverso. The definitions dated October 2000 are on the web site. Holly Hamilton reported that the southern counties had decided to meet with the northern counties for this meeting.
5. Southern Regional Meeting Report-none provided; included in the northern report.
6. CalWORKs Report and Questions-Warren Ghens discussed Class 600 and how to determine the Work Participation Average Hours Per Week formula. Warren said reviewers need to take the entire month's hours and divide the number by 4.3 to determine if a person met the work requirements. On a supplemental case review, the reviewer must prorate the hours to determine the assistance month hours the person worked. Hopie Rios asked what constituted a secondary case? Warren responded that a transmittal already exists that covers this question, however, he did not recall the transmittal number. Warren will check with Jim Anderson and forward this information to the PMC supervisors. Warren indicated that a concern had been raised about two issues. The first was that the Q5 did not allow capturing a client's failure to act and there was no way to identify errors caused by the computer. Counties proposed that three items be added to the Q5 in the future that would capture this information. Warren handed out a proposal that would address these PMC concerns. Warren stated he wanted input from the PMC supervisors by September 27, 2000. Proposed items would be added to the appropriate class.
7. Food Stamps Report and Questions-Michael Bowman-Jones provided handouts on four areas he discussed. Michael provided information on military personnel receiving Food Stamps; Cost of

Living Adjustment-maximum allotments and eligibility standards for Food Stamps. Michael also handed out ACL 80-00 that discusses the extension of CFAP through September 2001. Michael also shared information he received from FNS on coding changes. The coding changes are effective with the Food Stamps October 2000 sample.

8. Field Operations Report-Tom Benson was not present and no presentation provided.
9. Q5I and Data Builders Presentation-Hector Hernandez updated the PMC supervisors on the status of equipment and the next phase of the Q5I rollout. Hector stated that SMU staff would be working with specific counties to have their PC's certified for beta testing. The certification process involved loading a CD disk on each PC used for Q5I purposes prior to loading the Q5I beta test software. The purpose of the CD certification process was to confirm that the necessary software and computer configuration had taken place. Richard Trujillo discussed the county Q5I beta test and roll out. Richard indicated the first group of counties would be receiving the CD certification disk and after passing certification, a beta CD disk of the Q5I would be forwarded to the county. Richard handed out draft instructions on beta testing requirements and the number of cases/time he wanted tested.  
Data Builders provided a demonstration of the Q5I application with an emphasis on receiving and assigning cases by the supervisor. Several suggestions on the screens were made by the attendees to Data Builders and the Taskforce. Data Builders, along with the Taskforce staff, agreed to review the recommendations for possible inclusion.
10. FNS 310 changes-Richard Trujillo has requested new FNS 310 manuals and will distribute to the PMC counties as soon as they arrive.
11. Corrective Action Report-Chris Waters handed out a "Best Practices" package that had been developed by her organization that explains the Large 8 products. Chris asked the PMC supervisors to review the material and provide her comments by September 15. Chris also handed out the most current rolling error rates for California. Based on preliminary findings and the Food Stamp national average, it appears that California will be sanctioned. Chris will update the PMC supervisors. Chris noted that the next Large 8 meeting was scheduled for Sacramento on October 5.
12. Reports Workgroup-Daphne Criswell was not present at the meeting. This item was postponed until the next meeting.
13. 2001 PMC meeting schedule-The PMC meeting schedule for 2001 was identified as follows:  
January 10  
February 14  
March 14  
April 11  
May 9  
June 13  
August 8  
September 12  
November 14  
\*\*\*No meetings were scheduled for July, October, and November.
14. Next Meeting-NOVEMBER 15, 2000
15. Closed cases-Hopie Rios wanted to know what the counties needed to send FNS on closed cases. Pete Flores responded and said that if the review on closed case had been completed, the county needed to send the income maintenance folder on it. If the closed case had not been completed (dropped for some reason) the counties did not have to send anything to FNS.

